The Water We Swim In

The Structure of a Stable Civilisation, Painted Whole and Without a Programme — How a People That Has Crossed the Metabolic Threshold Lives Past the Carrying Capacity of the Bare Land and Therefore Cannot Live Without Its Coordination; How a Class That Interprets What the Many Cannot Check Arises From the Architecture of the Mind; How, When Things Are Stable, a Few Come to Hold the Surplus, Write the Society's Rights and Wrongs, and Form the Young So the Order Feels Like the World; How It Runs Itself Because People Police Themselves; How the Terms Criminal, Heretic, Barbarian, and Terrorist License the Force Without the Rest Reacting; and Why the Natural Wish to Kill the Apex and Tear Out the Interpreter Class Invites the Warlord, Springs the Metabolic Trap, and Summons a New Apex in the Same Shape — So That the Whole Is Double, Extracting and Sustaining at Once, and the Only Thing This Study Offers Is the Sight of It

Thomas J. Bryan

with Claude (Anthropic)

Patterns of Power · 2026

Preface

❧

This study is the collection's panorama. The others took the structure of a stable society apart one mechanism at a time; this one assembles the whole machine in a single view, for a reader who has never been shown the walls of the room they have always lived in. And it does something the others did not: it paints the picture and declines to prescribe. It hands over the terrain, including the trap built into it, and then stops — because for a structure built so thoroughly to be invisible to those inside it, the plain sight of the thing is gift enough, and what to do about it is not this study's to say.

The picture runs in a sequence. A stable advanced society has crossed a metabolic threshold, sustaining far more people than the bare land could feed, so that it cannot live without its coordination. That coordination divides knowing so finely that everyone must trust knowers they cannot check, and a class that holds what the many cannot verify arises from the architecture of the mind. When things are stable, a few come to hold the surplus, resting on a floor of force overlaid with a managed belief; they write the society's rights and wrongs, which coordinate genuinely and favour them at once, and form the young so the order feels like the world. It runs itself, because people police themselves and one another, the state's force held in reserve and used — when used — on those first named across the moral line: the criminal, the heretic, the barbarian, the terrorist. And the natural wish to tear the whole thing down invites the warlord, springs the metabolic trap, and rebuilds the structure in the same shape, because the men at the top were never its cause.

Through all of it the study holds one discipline above the rest: the whole is double. The same apparatus extracts and sustains; the same coordination is captured by the few and needed by the many; the same craft is a genuine good and the seam of a genuine oppression. There is no clean enemy to kill and no veil to lift, and both the apologist and the avenger have seized one face of a thing that has two. The study does not counsel contentment with the extraction, which is real, nor rage spent on a move the structure has already defeated; it counsels only the sight of the whole, which is the precondition of doing anything real rather than anything merely satisfying. *Tested, never revealed.*

A Note on This Collaboration

❧

This study, like the rest of the collection, is a collaboration between a human author and an artificial intelligence. Its aim is the author's: to paint the structural picture plainly, for ordinary people, so that those who genuinely want to improve the common man's life can see exactly what they are up against — the cognitive architecture that makes the structure durable and invisible, the metabolic trap that punishes its destruction, the craft of rule that keeps things running for a real benefit even as it serves a real extraction. The author has insisted throughout that the purpose is to lay out the structure, not to tell anyone what to do, and that the picture be held without despair, because seeing clearly is not surrender but its opposite.

The framing, the marshalling of the scholarship, the verification, and the writing are Claude's (Anthropic), developed in dialogue with the author and to the project's standing rules. The study brackets the truth of every faith and ideology it touches, examining the heretic and the believer alike only as structure; it analyses structure rather than character, and treats motives as genuinely double; it holds the suffering it describes — the famine of the metabolic trap, the bodies on the far side of the moral line — with gravity; it credits the coordination as a real good as readily as it names the extraction as a real wrong; and where it draws on the collection's other studies it describes the dynamic it is borrowing, so that this picture stands whole on its own.

The Argument in Seven Parts

❧

The picture, in seven parts, runs as follows.

Part I — The Threshold Behind You. The ground: a stable advanced society has moved beyond warlordism and beyond the carrying capacity of the bare land, sustaining far more people than the unassisted earth could feed; so the population depends on its coordination to live, and the threshold is crossed one way only, because to remove the coordination is to collect the difference as death.

Part II — The Trust You Cannot Avoid. Why a class that knows what the many cannot check is a necessity, not an imposition: a finely divided society leaves no one able to verify more than a sliver, so all must trust knowers they cannot check; the mind is built to grant that trust, deferring to the marked source; and an interpreter class forms by necessity, doing real work and holding a real lever at once.

Part III — How the Few Come to Hold the Surplus. How a durable hierarchy forms: the surplus concentrates, and a few come to hold it not by constant force but by a floor of force overlaid with a managed belief; they acquire a belief that makes their place feel right, write the society's rights and wrongs to coordinate and to favour themselves at once, and form the young so the order is felt not as imposition but as the world.

Part IV — Why It Runs Itself. Why it runs itself with almost no force: people police themselves from the inside, having been formed to hold the order's rights and wrongs as their own; they police one another from the side through praise and disparagement; and behind these the state's force stands in reserve, needed rarely precisely because the first two do nearly all the work.

Part V — The Terms That License the Force. How the reserve force is used without provoking the many: it falls on those first defined out of the circle in which moral rules apply; the human capacity to switch off moral restraint toward the excluded is well attested; and the power to set the terms — criminal, heretic, barbarian, terrorist — is the power to use force cheaply, the more so because the terms are entangled with real threats.

Part VI — The Trap. Why the natural response fails: the wish to kill the apex and tear out the interpreter class mistakes the structure for the men atop it; to tear out the coordinating apparatus destroys the metabolism the body lives by, so the warlord returns, the metabolic trap springs and the difference is collected as death, and a new apex and interpreter class arise in the same shape.

Part VII — The Picture, Whole. The structure assembled in one view, and the one thing the study will and will not do: that the whole is double through and through, the same apparatus extracting and sustaining, so there is no clean enemy to kill and no veil to lift; and that the study, having painted the picture, declines to tell you what to do with it, claiming only that nothing real can be done by anyone who has not first seen it whole.

Part I

The Threshold Behind You

The ground the whole picture stands on — that a stable advanced society is one that has already moved beyond the war of all against all and beyond the carrying capacity of the bare land, lifted past what the unassisted earth could feed by coordination, division of labour, and intensive farming; that the population therefore depends on the coordination to survive, there being now far more people than the land alone could carry; and that this threshold is crossed in one direction only, because to remove the coordination is to collect the difference as death

I. More People Than the Land Can Feed

Begin with the fact you are least able to see, because you are standing on it. If you live in a stable or even a roughly stable advanced society, you live on the far side of a threshold that your ancestors crossed long ago and that you have never had cause to notice, because everything you have ever known has been on this side of it. The threshold is this: your society feeds, houses, and sustains far more people than the bare land beneath it could ever feed on its own. A patch of unimproved earth, worked by people foraging or scratching at it without the accumulated apparatus of a civilisation, supports a certain thin number of human beings and no more — its natural carrying capacity. Every stable advanced society has broken through that ceiling and now carries a population many times larger, and it has done so by a particular and demanding means: by coordination. By the division of labour, in which no one does everything and each does one thing for all; by intensive agriculture, which the economist Ester Boserup showed wrings far more food from the same ground at the cost of far more labour, the foraging band's few hours of daily effort giving way to the farmer's dawn-to-dusk toil precisely because there are now so many mouths that the easier ways will no longer feed them; by the granaries, the roads, the irrigation, the markets, the records, and the thousand other works that let a great many strangers act together as one productive body. The anthropologist Joseph Tainter, surveying the rise and fall of complex societies from Rome to the Maya, described the engine plainly: a society finds a surplus, managing the surplus makes it more complex, and the complexity, for a long while, pays for itself by producing more than it costs — and the population grows into the room the complexity makes, until there are far more people alive than there could have been without it.

This is the metabolic threshold, and the word is chosen with care, because what the coordination does for a society is what a metabolism does for a body: it is the continuous, mostly invisible work of converting the world into sustenance for the whole, and the whole cannot live without it. Once a population has grown into the space that coordination opens, the coordination is no longer a convenience that improves life at the margin; it is the thing keeping the extra millions alive, because those millions exist only because it exists. The bread on the table is the output of a supply chain of staggering length and fineness, and the person eating it could not produce a hundredth of it alone, and neither could anyone else, and the only reason there is bread is that the coordination ran today as it ran yesterday. And this is the first thing the picture asks you to see and the thing hardest to see, because a working metabolism is silent. You do not feel your own unless it falters; you do not see the coordination that feeds a city unless it stops. While it runs, the bread is simply there, the water is simply there, the order is simply there, and it does not look like an achievement or an apparatus or a made thing at all. It looks like the world.

II. The One-Way Door

The threshold has a property that everything later in this picture turns upon: it is, under ordinary conditions, a one-way door. A population can cross it going up, growing into the room that coordination makes, over generations. It cannot simply walk back across it going down without the difference between the two carrying capacities — the high one the coordination sustains and the low one the bare land would sustain — being collected, and it is collected in the only currency available, which is human death. When the coordination of a complex society fails, the society does not gently descend to a simpler and poorer version of itself with everyone intact; the population that the coordination was keeping alive above the natural ceiling falls back toward that ceiling, and the falling is famine, disorder, and mass death. Tainter called the event collapse and described it precisely as a rapid loss of complexity, a society shedding in years the coordinating structure it took centuries to build — and the collection's other studies have counted the cost of particular instances, the

Roman west where the population of the city of Rome fell from perhaps a million to some tens of thousands within a few generations of the machine's failure, the famines that followed the violent reorganisation of agriculture in the twentieth century, the recurring lesson that the bill for lost coordination is paid in lives. This is not an argument that the coordination is good, or just, or fairly shared; those questions come later and their answers are hard. It is only the statement of the ground: that you live above a threshold, that the coordination is what holds you there, and that the door back down is not an exit but a fall. Hold that, because every other part of the picture is built on it, and the most dangerous errors people make about their own societies are errors that forget it.

Part II

The Trust You Cannot Avoid

Why a class that knows what the many cannot check is not an imposition but a necessity — that a society divided finely enough into specialised labours leaves no one able to verify more than a sliver of what they must rely on, so that everyone is compelled to trust knowers they cannot check; that the human mind is built to grant exactly this trust, deferring to the marked source rather than testing the claim; and that an interpreter class therefore forms by structural necessity, doing real work and holding, in the same motion, a real lever

I. No One Can Check More Than a Sliver

The same division of labour that lets a population exceed the carrying capacity of the land has a second consequence, quieter than the first and just as inescapable, and it concerns not the stomach but the mind. When labour is divided finely enough to feed a great civilisation, knowledge is divided with it, because each specialised task carries a specialised knowing that the specialist holds and the rest do not. And the division goes so far that no single person can hold more than a vanishing fraction of what their own life depends upon. You cannot grow your food, and you also cannot test whether the medicine you are given is sound, verify that the bridge you cross was built to hold, check the law you are subject to against the whole body of law, audit the bank that holds your money, or confirm for yourself almost any of the ten thousand technical facts on which your day silently rests. You take them on trust, from people whose competence you cannot personally assess, because there is no alternative — the philosopher John Hardwig made the point sharply, that the amount any rational person must believe on the say-so of others vastly exceeds what they could ever establish for themselves, so that trusting experts one cannot check is not a lapse from reason but a requirement of it in any world too complex for a single mind. Philosophers call the resulting arrangement the division of cognitive labour, and it is the exact twin, in the realm of knowing, of the division of physical labour in the realm of making: just as you depend for your bread on farmers you will never meet, you depend for your beliefs on knowers you will never check, and the dependence is as deep and as unavoidable in the one case as the other.

This is the cognitive face of the whole structure, and it is the part the picture most needs you to take in, because it is the part people most often miss when they imagine that a society could be set free simply by giving everyone the facts. There is no condition, in a complex society, in which everyone holds all the facts and checks all the claims, because the knowledge is larger than any mind and must be parcelled out, and the parcelling means that for almost everything you must rely on someone who knows what you cannot. The dependence cannot be abolished, only arranged. And it means that in every complex society there must be — not as a corruption but as a structural necessity, the way the body must have organs — a class of people who hold the knowledge the rest defer to: the ones who can read what others cannot, interpret what others cannot, heal or build or judge or calculate what others cannot, and whose word on these matters the rest must, in the main, simply take.

II. The Mind That Defers to the Mark

The reason this dependence so reliably becomes a lever of power, rather than remaining a neutral fact of life, lies in how the mind grants its trust, and the collection's study of our mental inheritance lays it out. The human mind did not evolve to verify claims; it evolved, over the long stretch of small-band life, to read sources. In a world of a few hundred known people, where status was earned in front of witnesses over a lifetime, deferring fast and below conscious thought to the figure marked as authoritative — the proven elder, the acknowledged expert of the band — was a sound and efficient rule. The mind still runs that rule, and in the vast society of strangers it misfires, firing now on the mark rather than the merit: on the title, the robe, the credential, the confident voice, the trappings that signal the right to be believed. People do not, for the most part, examine the claim and then decide; they read the source for the marks of authority and defer to the marks, because that is what the machinery does. And the trust is laid down early, in a formation that arrives before the person can weigh it — the child absorbs who is to be believed and what is simply true long before it has the capacity to evaluate any of it, so that by the time the capacity arrives the beliefs are already the floor it stands on rather than propositions it might examine.

Put the necessity and the mechanism together and you have the interpreter class, the standing feature of every complex society: a body of people who hold knowledge the many cannot check, deferred to by a mind built to defer to the marks they bear, their authority resting not on the population's verification, which is impossible, but on the population's formed and largely automatic trust. And here, for the first time but not the last, the picture shows its doubleness, which you must hold onto through everything that follows, because losing it is the source of nearly every error people make about power. The interpreter class is, at one and the same time, genuinely useful and genuinely dangerous, and not in alternation but in the same act. The physician really heals, and is also believed past the point of evidence because of the white coat; the judge really resolves the disputes a society could not otherwise resolve, and also pronounces, with the same robed authority, the readings that happen to suit the powerful; the expert really knows, and trades on the knowing to be believed where they merely assert. The class does the real work the division of labour requires, and holds, in the very same position, the lever that the mind's automatic deference makes available. It is not a parasite that could be cut away to reveal a healthy body beneath; it is an organ, doing the body's work and able, like any organ that turns, to feed on the body it serves.

Part III

How the Few Come to Hold the Surplus

How a durable hierarchy forms when a society is stable — that the surplus the coordination produces is concentrated, a few coming to hold the greater part of it not by force at every moment, which is impossible, but by a floor of force overlaid with a managed belief; how that few acquire a belief that makes their place feel right, write the society's rights and wrongs to coordinate genuinely and to favour themselves at once, and form the young so that what people value and what they fear are set in advance; and why the result is experienced not as imposition but as the natural order

I. The Floor and the Belief

A society that stays stable long enough does not remain flat. The surplus that the coordination produces — the food and goods and labour beyond what the producers consume — is a prize, and over time it concentrates, until a few come to hold and consume the greater part of it while the many who produced it hold little. Tainter traced the mechanism in the rise of complexity itself: managing the surplus builds the hierarchy that manages it, and the managers, sitting where the surplus flows, take their share and then more than their share, until in the late stages of many a society the elite is extracting all that can be extracted and a little beyond. How a few come to hold the surplus of the many is the oldest question about power, and the answer is not, cannot be, force applied at every point, because the arithmetic forbids it: the many vastly outnumber the few, and no force the few command could stand over every producer at every moment to compel the handing-over. Sustained extraction on that scale cannot be purchased with coercion alone; it is too expensive, and the few could never afford the guards.

What makes it possible is the arrangement the collection's foundational study calls a floor of force with a managed belief laid over it. At the founding, force establishes the hard floor — establishes that the producers cannot simply leave, refuse, or overturn the arrangement, that the attempt will be met and broken. But force, having set the floor, is drawn back to the margins and held in reserve, because over the floor is laid the thing that does the daily work: a belief, managed and transmitted, that makes the arrangement feel not like a robbery the producers endure but like the rightful order of the world. The few come to hold a belief system — a religion, an ideology, a story of merit or blood or destiny or nature — that explains why their place at the top is fitting, and the belief is not, in the main, a lie they cynically deploy; they mostly hold it themselves, having been formed in it as their subjects were, which makes them more convincing and not less. They shape the society's laws, its formal rights and wrongs, and here the doubleness is at its sharpest and most important: those laws genuinely coordinate, really do resolve disputes and enforce contracts and keep an order the many themselves need and would be worse without — and they are tilted, in a thousand ways large and small, to protect the holdings and the position of the few who shaped them. The law is a real public good and a rigged game at once, and the philosopher who said the ruling ideas of any age are the ideas of its ruling class was pointing at the rigging, but he would have been wrong to deny the genuine good, and the picture requires you to see both at the same time.

II. Setting the Dials Before You Can Weigh Them

The deepest part of the arrangement is not the law, which is visible and can be argued with, but the formation, which is invisible and cannot, because it happens before the person it forms can argue at all. The collection models the way people decide as a weighing of cost against benefit from where they stand — not a conspiracy, simply each person reading the rewards and penalties their position presents and acting accordingly — and it locates the leverage in two settings it calls the dials. The first dial is what a person counts as a benefit, as good, as worth wanting, and this is not read off the world but installed, early, by others: a child is formed into valuing what its society teaches it to value, honouring what it is taught to honour, wanting what it is given to want, and that formation sets the benefit side of every calculation the person will ever make, long before they could weigh whether to accept it. The second dial is what a person counts as a cost, and chiefly whether deviation will really be punished, which the same formation supplies, teaching the child what is shameful, what is dangerous, what is simply not done. Whoever controls the formation of the young sets both dials, and an order that has held long enough controls the formation of the young as a matter of course, through the

family and the school and the rite and the story, so that each generation arrives already wanting what the order rewards and fearing what it punishes, already fitted to it from the inside.

This is why a durable hierarchy is not experienced, by the people living within it, as a hierarchy pressing down on them, but as the natural order of things — as simply how the world is and ought to be. The arrangement that an outsider or a later age might see plainly as the extraction of the many's surplus by the few is, to the person formed within it, not an arrangement at all but the shape of reality, the rights and wrongs that any decent person holds, the way things have always rightly been. The producer who hands over the greater part of what he makes does not, in the main, experience himself as robbed; he experiences himself as paying what is owed, honouring what is honourable, living rightly. The dials have been set so that the order runs with his consent and through his own values, and this — not the floor of force, which is held in reserve and rarely shown — is what makes the whole thing hold. It is the water, and he is the fish, and the water is not something he is in. It is, as far as he can tell, simply everything there is.

Part IV

Why It Runs Itself

How an order, once set, sustains itself with almost no force — because the people within it police themselves from the inside, having been formed to hold its rights and wrongs as their own; because they police one another from the side, praising those who act rightly and disparaging those who act wrongly at no cost to anyone above; and because behind these stands the state's force, held in reserve and rarely shown, needed rarely precisely because the first two do nearly all the work

I. The Order That Needs No Hand

The most remarkable property of a durable order, and the one that most completely hides it from the people inside it, is that it runs itself. It does not require a hand on it, a ruler issuing constant commands, a force compelling each act of compliance; once the dials are set and the belief is installed, the thing turns on its own, and it turns because the people within it do the work of holding it up, mostly without knowing that this is what they are doing. The first and deepest of the mechanisms is self-policing. A person formed to hold the order's rights and wrongs as their own values does not need to be watched, because they watch themselves: they feel the pull toward what they have been taught is right and the recoil from what they have been taught is wrong, feel pride in conforming and guilt in deviating, and these feelings are not impositions they resent but their own conscience, the very core of who they take themselves to be. The order has been built into the self, so that in policing themselves the people are not obeying an external master but being true to their own deepest sense of how to live — which is the cheapest and most thorough enforcement there is, an enforcement that follows the person everywhere and never sleeps, because it is not over them but within them.

The second mechanism works from the side, among equals, and costs the powerful nothing at all. People do not only police themselves; they police one another, through the constant, unorganised pressure of approval and disapproval that the sociologist Émile Durkheim recognised as the way a society's shared morality enforces itself. Those who act as the order counts right are praised, included, respected, held up as good; those who act as it counts wrong are disparaged, shamed, excluded, marked as bad — and the experiments of social psychology have shown how fiercely the human animal feels this pressure, how far an ordinary person will bend to avoid the disapproval of the group and to keep its regard. This horizontal enforcement is enormously powerful and entirely free to those at the top, because it is carried out by the many upon the many, neighbour upon neighbour, each enforcing the order's norms on all the others while believing themselves simply to be upholding decency. A producer who began to question the arrangement would meet not the state's force but his neighbours' disapproval, his family's shame, his community's cold shoulder, long before any official took notice — and for most people, most of the time, that is more than enough.

II. The Force Held in Reserve

Behind the self-policing and the social pressure stands the third mechanism, the state's force, and the crucial thing to see is how rarely it has to be used and why. It is real: the order rests, at the last, on the capacity to compel, on the police and the prison and the soldier, and that capacity is what the foundational floor of force amounts to, persisting beneath everything. But in a stable order it is mostly held in reserve, shown seldom, applied to few, because the two prior mechanisms have already done nearly all the work of keeping the population in its place — and they have done it so thoroughly that the force can stay out of sight, which is precisely what lets the order feel free and consensual rather than coerced. A society in which the force had to be applied constantly, to everyone, would be a society whose belief had failed, an unstable and expensive tyranny visibly holding itself together by violence; a society in which the force almost never appears, because the people govern themselves through their own values and one another through their own disapproval, is a stable order, and its stability is exactly the measure of how completely the belief has done its work. The reserve force is the floor you do not see because you are standing well above it, kept aloft by your own formation and your neighbours' regard. But it is there, and the next part concerns the question of whom, when it is finally used, it is used upon — because it is not used evenly, and the pattern of its use reveals something the picture cannot leave out.

Part V

The Terms That License the Force

How the reserve force is used without provoking the many to resist — that it falls not on everyone but on categories of person first defined out of the circle in which a society's moral rules apply; that the human capacity to switch off its own moral restraint toward those it has placed outside the circle is well attested, so that the same citizen who would resist violence against his own will accept or applaud it against the excluded; and how the power to set the terms — criminal, heretic, barbarian, terrorist — is the power to use force cheaply, the more so because the terms are entangled with real threats and so cannot simply be refused

I. The Circle and the Line

The state's force, held in reserve, is not in the end used evenly across the population, and it could not be, for the same arithmetic that forbids ruling the many by force forbids coercing them all at once: if the violence fell on everyone, everyone would have reason to resist it together, and the many would overwhelm the few. The force is used, instead, selectively, and the selection follows a pattern the picture must name because it is among the most consequential and least examined of all the mechanisms. The force falls on categories of person who have first been placed outside the circle within which the society's moral rules fully apply — and the placing-outside is what makes the force usable without provoking the rest. Social psychologists call that circle the scope of justice or the moral circle, and the researcher Susan Opotow described the act of moral exclusion as the drawing of a line that puts certain people beyond the boundary where considerations of fairness and harm are felt to hold, so that injuring them no longer registers, to those inside, as the kind of wrong it would be to injure one of their own. Inside the circle, harm to a person is felt as harm and resisted; outside it, the same harm is felt as something else — as justice, as safety, as necessity, as nothing at all.

The human capacity to perform this switch is deep and well attested, and it is the hinge of the whole mechanism. The psychologist Albert Bandura, studying how ordinary people of ordinary morality come to take part in or accept cruelty, showed that the moral restraints which normally stop us harming others do not operate automatically but must be active, and can be selectively switched off toward particular targets by a set of identifiable manoeuvres: by casting the harm as serving a worthy end, by wrapping it in sanitising language that hides what is being done, by diffusing the responsibility until no one feels it as theirs, and above all by dehumanising the victims and blaming them for their own fate. The decisive finding, the one that makes this a structural fact and not a remark about wicked individuals, is that the very same person, holding the very same moral standards, will harm or refuse to harm depending only on whether the target has been placed inside the circle or outside it. It is not that cruel acts are done by cruel people; it is that ordinary people, their moral restraint switched off toward the excluded by these familiar manoeuvres, will do or countenance toward those outside the circle what they would never do toward those inside it. And the philosopher Giorgio Agamben gave the political form of this its starkest name in the figure he called homo sacer, the one who may be killed without the killing counting as murder — the person the sovereign power has placed in a zone where the ordinary law is suspended for him alone, included in the order precisely by being excluded from its protections, his life made bare and available to a force that, applied to anyone inside the circle, would be a crime and a scandal.

II. The Power to Name

It follows that the power to set the terms — to say who shall count as placed outside the circle — is one of the most valuable powers in the whole structure, because it is the power to use the reserve force without paying the political price that using it on the included would exact. The terms vary across societies and ages, but the function is constant, and a society can be read by the names it gives to those it has placed beyond its moral line: the criminal, defined out by the law; the heretic, defined out by the belief, whose truth this study brackets entirely and whose treatment it examines only as structure; the barbarian or the savage, defined out by the boundary of the people; the traitor, the enemy of the people, the terrorist, defined out by the politics of the moment. To attach one of these terms to a person or a group is to move them across the line, to switch off the ordinary citizen's moral restraint toward them, and so to make available against them a force that the citizen would resist if it were turned on those still inside the circle — and to make it available not over the citizen's objection but with the citizen's approval, even his demand, because he has been brought to see the excluded

not as victims of the force but as its justification. This is how a state uses its violence without uniting the many against it: by never, if it can help it, using it on the many, but only on those it has first successfully named out of the many, while the rest watch with the comfortable sense that justice is being done to someone who is not like them.

And here the picture insists, as it has insisted throughout, on the doubleness, because without it this mechanism would be misunderstood in the direction of paranoia, which is its own kind of blindness. The terms are not pure inventions laid over the innocent; they are entangled, always, with real threats, and that entanglement is exactly what gives them their power and makes them so hard to resist. Some of those called criminal have genuinely preyed on their neighbours; some called enemies have genuinely meant harm; the violence the state holds in reserve is not only a tool of extraction but also, sometimes, a genuine protection that the many genuinely need, the floor that keeps the predator off the weak. The mechanism works precisely because the categories are not empty — because there is a real criminal behind the expansive use of the criminal law, a real enemy behind the expansive use of the enemy's name — so that to reject the term wholesale is to deny a danger that is sometimes real, and to accept it wholesale is to license a force that is often turned beyond its warrant. The line is real and it is also movable, drawn around genuine threats and then quietly widened to take in the inconvenient, the dissenting, the merely different; and the power that draws it, and widens it, is holding one of the master levers of the entire structure. Seeing this is not the same as concluding that every use of the terms is a fraud. It is seeing that the terms are a lever, that the lever is held, and that the same names which sometimes mark a real danger are also the names by which a force is turned, cheaply and with applause, upon whoever the holder of the lever needs turned upon.

Part VI

The Trap

Why the natural response to seeing all this fails — that the wish to kill the apex and tear out the interpreter class, however earned by the extraction and the licensed violence, mistakes the structure for the men at its top; that to tear out the coordinating apparatus is not to free the body beneath it but to destroy the metabolism the body lives by, so that the warlord returns to the vacuum, the metabolic trap springs and the difference is collected as death, and a new interpreter class and a new apex arise in the same shape because the functions that made them were never abolished

I. The Wish and the Grievance

If you have followed the picture to here, you have seen a structure that extracts the surplus of the many for the few, dresses the extraction as the natural order, sets the dials of value and fear in the young before they can resist, runs itself through the people's own consciences and their neighbours' disapproval, and turns its reserved violence, with the people's own approval, upon whoever it can name across the moral line. And the natural response to seeing this — the human, the righteous, the entirely understandable response — is rage at the few who sit at the top of it, and the wish to tear the whole thing down: to kill the apex, to destroy the interpreter class that sanctifies it, to smash the apparatus and free the many from the arrangement that has used them. The picture does not tell you that this rage is wrong to feel, and it does not deny the grievance that feeds it, because the grievance is real. The extraction is real; the rigging of the rights and wrongs is real; the violence turned on the excluded is real, and falls on real bodies. Nothing in what follows is a defence of the arrangement or a counsel to be content with it. It is, instead, the one thing the picture most needs you to understand if you care about the lives of the many rather than only about the satisfaction of the rage: that the natural response, acted on directly, does not free the many but destroys them, and that it does so for reasons built into the structure itself.

The error in the response is that it mistakes the structure for the men at the top of it — imagines that the apex and the interpreter class are a thing laid over an otherwise healthy body, a parasite that could be torn away to leave the body free and whole beneath. But the apparatus you would tear out is not laid over the coordination; it is the coordination, or rather the coordination runs through it, is administered by it, is held together by the very offices and knowings and institutions you would destroy. The interpreter class that sanctifies the order is also the class that holds the apprenticed knowledge of how the order's complex functions are actually run — the law, the administration, the management of the granary and the trade and the thousand coordinations the population lives by — for this knowledge, the collection has shown elsewhere, is a real craft, learned slowly through practice and passed hand to hand, not a set of instructions any willing person could pick up from a book the morning after the revolution. Tear out the apex and the interpreter class, and you do not release the coordination; you decapitate it, and the coordination stops.

II. The Warlord, the Famine, and the New Apex

What follows the destruction of a coordinating apparatus follows in a grim order that the historical record shows again and again, and it is the metabolic threshold of the first part collecting its due. First the warlord returns. Into the vacuum where the coordinating structure stood, naked force rushes back, because naked force is what is left when the managed structure that held it in reserve is gone — local strongmen, armed bands, the rule of whoever can take and hold by violence, the war of all against all that the civilisation had climbed above. The floor of force, no longer overlaid and held in reserve by a working belief and a working administration, becomes the whole of the order again, and the society falls back toward the warlordism from which durable hierarchies are originally built. Then the metabolic trap springs. The coordination that fed the population above the carrying capacity of the bare land is gone, and the difference between the high number the coordination sustained and the low number the land alone can feed is collected, as it can only be collected, in death — in the famine, the disorder, the collapse of the supply chains that a complex population cannot live without, the bill of the threshold falling due all at once. The twentieth century ran this experiment more than once, tearing out the coordination of agriculture in the name of liberation and reaping famines that killed millions; the ancient world ran it when its great coordinating empires failed and its cities emptied; and the

lesson is always the same, that the coordination was keeping people alive, and that destroying it kills them, whatever the justice of the grievance against those who sat atop it.

And then, last, the structure reasserts itself, and a new apex and a new interpreter class arise in the same shape as the old. This is the part that most confounds the hopeful, and it is the deepest point in the whole picture: that the men at the top were never the cause of the structure, only its current occupants, and that removing them removes occupants and not the structure. For the functions that produced the apex and the interpreter class were not abolished by the revolution; they cannot be abolished, because they are entailed by the threshold and the cognitive architecture and the metabolic necessity that this picture began with. The population still cannot live without coordination; someone must therefore coordinate. The many still cannot each know what all must rely on; some must therefore be deferred to. The surplus must still be managed; some hand must therefore manage it, and the hand that manages the surplus sits where the surplus flows. So out of the wreckage the functions call their offices back into being — a new coordinating apparatus, a new class that holds the knowledge and is deferred to, a new few who come to hold the surplus and to write the new rights and wrongs and to form the young and to name the new enemies across the new moral line — and the revolution that set out to abolish the hierarchy finds that it has, after a season of warlordism and famine, rebuilt one, often harsher than the first because it must hold by force what the old one held by long-settled belief. The collection has watched this happen in case after case, the liberation hardening into a new domination, the new class settling into the chairs of the old, because the chairs were never the problem; the structure that requires the chairs was the problem, and the structure survived the men.

Part VII

The Picture, Whole

The structure assembled in one view, and the single thing this study will and will not do — that the whole is double through and through, the same apparatus extracting and sustaining, the same coordination captured by the few and needed by the many, the same craft a genuine good and the seam of a genuine oppression; that there is therefore no clean enemy to kill and no veil to lift, and both the apologist and the avenger are wrong; and that this study, having painted the picture, declines to tell you what to do with it, claiming only that nothing real can be done by anyone who has not first seen it whole

I. Double All the Way Down

Step back now and let the whole picture stand in one view, because its meaning is in the whole and not in any part. You live above a threshold, sustained by a coordination you cannot see and cannot live without, a population grown past the carrying capacity of the bare land and dependent for its life on the continued working of the metabolism that feeds it. That coordination requires a division of labour so fine that no one can know more than a sliver of it, which compels everyone to trust knowers they cannot check, which the mind is built to do by deferring to the marks of authority, which raises up an interpreter class that holds the knowledge and is deferred to. When the society is stable, the surplus the coordination produces concentrates, and a few come to hold it, resting their hold on a floor of force overlaid with a managed belief — a belief they mostly share, a body of law that genuinely coordinates and is genuinely tilted toward them, a formation of the young that sets the dials of value and fear before anyone can weigh them, so that the order is experienced not as imposition but as the world. It runs itself, because the people police themselves through their own consciences and one another through their own disapproval, and the force can stay in reserve, shown rarely and used, when used, upon those first named across the moral line — the criminal, the heretic, the barbarian, the terrorist — so that the violence falls without uniting the many against it. And the whole thing reproduces itself, and reasserts itself when torn down, because it is not the men at the top but the structure beneath them, entailed by the threshold and the mind and the necessity of coordination, that calls the offices endlessly back into being.

What the assembled picture shows, above everything, is that it is double through and through, and this is the hardest thing to hold and the most important. The same apparatus that extracts the surplus is the one that sustains the population; the same coordination the few have captured is the one the many cannot live without; the same craft of rule that runs the granary and the court and the trade is the craft that sanctifies the extraction and names the enemies; the same belief that reconciles the producer to his place also gives him the order and the meaning and the peace that the war of all against all would take away. There is no layer of the structure that is purely a parasite to be cut off, and no layer that is purely a benefit to be kept; every part of it faces both ways at once, doing the body's work and feeding on the body in the same motion. This is why there is no clean enemy in the picture to kill, and no veil over it to lift — why the avenger who would tear out the apex to free the body destroys the body, and why the apologist who would defend the order as simply benevolent defends a real extraction and a real violence as though they were not there. Both have seized one face of a thing that has two, and the truth is not between them but in the doubleness itself, which neither can bear to hold because holding it offers no clean act and no clear enemy, only the sight of a structure that is genuinely both at once.

II. The Sight of It Is the Whole of What I Offer

This study ends, deliberately, without telling you what to do, and the refusal is not evasion but the keeping of a promise the subject demands. Other studies in this collection have gone on to ask what posture might hold such a structure to better account, and have offered their answers; this one does not, because its purpose was different from theirs — not to counsel a course but to paint the picture, so that whoever would act has first seen the ground they would act upon. And the ground, painted whole, says two things to anyone who has taken it in. It says, first, that the naive response fails — that the direct attempt to free the many by destroying the apex and the interpreter class does not free them but invites the warlord, springs the metabolic trap, and rebuilds the structure in a harsher form, so that the energy and the hope and the courage of those who most want the common man's life improved are, when spent that way, spent on a move the structure has already defeated, again and again, across all of recorded history. And it says, second, that this is not a counsel of despair, because seeing a structure clearly is not the same as surrendering to it; it is the precondition of doing

anything real about it rather than anything merely satisfying. The person who understands the metabolic threshold will not mistake the coordination for a parasite. The person who understands the cognitive face of the division of labour will not imagine that handing out facts dissolves the interpreter class. The person who understands the dials will not expect that the formed values of a people can be argued away in an afternoon. The person who understands the terms that license the force will watch the drawing of the moral line, and notice when it widens. None of this tells you what to do; all of it changes what it is possible to do well, by replacing the comfortable false pictures — the order is only benevolent, the order is only theft, the people are only waiting for a veil to be lifted — with the harder true one.

That is the whole of what this study offers, and it offers it without apology, because in a structure built so thoroughly to be invisible to those inside it, the plain sight of the thing is not a small gift. You are in the water. The water sustains you and the water shapes you and the water is held in a particular set of hands, and most who have ever lived in it have never seen that it was there at all, taking it for the simple shape of the world. To see it — to see the threshold behind you and the coordination around you and the dials within you and the line drawn through your fellows and the chairs that fill again whenever they are emptied — is to stand, for the first time, in a position to think about it rather than only from within it. What you then think, and what if anything you do, this study leaves entirely to you, claiming only, and as firmly as it can, that nothing you do will be real if you have not first seen the whole of what you are doing it to. The picture is the gift. The rest is yours. Tested, never revealed.

A Note on Sources

❧

This study is a synthesis of the whole collection, painted for a general reader; it rests its load-bearing claims on standard scholarship, brackets the truth of every faith and ideology it touches, and holds the suffering it describes with gravity. Quotations are avoided in favour of paraphrase.

The metabolic threshold — that coordination and intensive agriculture sustain populations far above the bare land's carrying capacity, and that the loss of that complexity is collected as rapid, lethal simplification — follows Ester Boserup on agricultural intensification and Joseph Tainter, *The Collapse of Complex Societies* (1988), on complexity as a problem-solving strategy with diminishing returns. The necessity of trusting knowers one cannot check, the cognitive face of the division of labour, follows John Hardwig on epistemic dependence and the literature on the division of cognitive labour. The reflex of deference to authority-marked sources, the floor of force and managed belief, the two dials of value and fear, and the self-running order are developed in the collection's foundational study; the internalisation of shared morality and its enforcement by approval and disapproval follow Émile Durkheim and the social psychology of conformity.

The mechanism by which the reserve force is licensed against the excluded follows the social psychology of moral exclusion (Susan Opotow on the scope of justice), the analysis of moral disengagement by which ordinary people of ordinary morality come to accept cruelty toward those placed outside the moral circle (Albert Bandura), and the political figure of the one who may be killed without it counting as murder (Giorgio Agamben, *Homo Sacer*, 1998). The doubleness of these terms — their entanglement with genuine threats — is held throughout. The concentration of ideas and law around the interests of a ruling stratum draws on the classical sociology of ideology (Marx and Engels), held against the genuine public good the same law performs.

The trap that defeats the destruction of the apex — the return of the warlord, the springing of the metabolic trap, and the rebuilding of the hierarchy in the same shape — together with the craft of rule as an apprenticed knowledge that cannot be quickly resumed, are worked out at length in the collection's companion studies, in particular *The Machine That Runs Itself*, the counterfactual on the fall of the Roman west, the studies of the interpreter class and information control, and the capstone *The Office and the Occupant*. Each dynamic invoked here is described in the text so that this picture stands whole on its own. *Part of the collection* Patterns of Power. *Tested, never revealed.*